

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 have been examined. Claims 1 and 5 have been amended, and claims 15 and 16 have been added. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

Claims 1-5, 12 and 13 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamazaki. This rejection is respectfully traversed in part and overcome in part.

As now amended, claim 1 claims a metal identification platelet equipped with an identification code that comprises a hologram. Further, the identification code comprises a passage-shaped hole and/or an external shape of the platelet. Merely by way of example, the passage-shaped hole could be in the shape of an alphanumeric character and the external shape could be circular or elongate with rounded ends. Hence, the platelet of claim 1 includes both a hologram and an additional “shape feature.” This “shape feature” may be an opening in the platelet or the outer shape of the platelet.

In contrast to the platelet of claim 1, the Yamazaki reference includes no description of a holograph with such a shaped hole or such an outer shaping. Hence, claim 1 which has been amended to include such limitations is distinguishable and in condition for allowance. Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1 and are distinguishable for at least the same reasons.

Independent claim 5 claims a method of producing an identification platelet and is far different from the method taught in Yamazaki. For example, with the method of claim 5, a shield is formed from an electro-insulation material on a shim with a holographic motif. The shim is then galvanized in places not covered by the shield. With Yamazaki, a conventional hologram is produced, followed by galvanoplastic copying. The hologram is exposed through the mask, followed by sandblasting. The result of the sandblasting depends on the mask pattern. Clearly, this sandblasting is far different from the galvanization process of claim 5. Hence, claim 5 is distinguishable without amendment.

However, in order to expedite prosecution, claim 5 has been amended to recite that the shield defines a certain shape. Also, the resulting platelet includes a through hole defined by at least a portion of the certain shape of the shield. Alternatively, or in addition to, the resulting platelet may also include an external shape defined by at least a portion of the certain shape of the shield. As previously described, such shaping (of a through hole or the external shape) is not taught by Yamazaki. Hence, claim 5 is distinguishable for this additional reason. Claims 12 and 13 depend from claim 5 and are distinguishable for at least the same reasons.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

Claims 1-5, 12 and 13 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious in view of Yamazaki. For at least the reasons given above, claims 1-5, 12 and 13 are not rendered obvious in view of Yamazaki.

Claims 1-6, 8, 9 and 11-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Gale, Mallik and Schaefer. As previously described, independent claims 1 and 5 are distinguishable over Yamazaki. Because the Gale, Mallik and Schaefer references also fail to teach the limitations of the independent claims, claims 1 and 5 are distinguishable. More specifically, Gale describes the partial etching of a structure and fails to teach any type of shaped identification code as now claimed in claims 1 and 5.

Mallik describes a sandwich structure, with the hologram effectively located on a different substrate. Nowhere in Mallik is there any teaching of a shaped identification code as now claimed. Finally, Yang relates to a painted product having circular grooves which are not part of the final product. As such, the structure referred to in Yang is far different from the platelet of claims 1 and 5.

The painting in Yang simply penetrates the metallic strips. Yang contains no teaches of platelet particles. Hence, the combination of Yang and Yamazaki fails to teach all of the limitations of claims 1 and 5. As such, independent claims 1 and 5, and claims 3, 4, 8, 9, and 11-13 are distinguishable and in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-9 and 11-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Gale, Mallik and Schaefer and further in view of Folger. The rejection in view of Yamazaki in view of Gale, Mallik and Schaefer was discussed above. Because the Folger reference also fails to teach the shaped identification feature of independent claims 1 and 5, claims 1-9 and 11-13 are distinguishable for at least the reasons previously recited.

Claims 1-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Gale, Mallik and Schaefer, Folger and further in view of Sakurai. The rejection in view of Yamazaki in view of Gale, Mallik, Schaefer and Folger was discussed above. Because the Sakurai reference also fails to teach the shaped identification feature of independent claims 1 and 5, claims 1 and 3-13 are distinguishable for at least the reasons previously recited.

Claims 1-5 and 12-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view Hirose. The rejection in view of Yamazaki was discussed above. Because the Hirose reference also fails to teach the shaped identification feature of independent claims 1 and 5, claims 1, 3-5 and 12-14 are distinguishable for at least the reasons previously recited.

Claims 1-3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang in view of Faris, Steenblik and Kaule. As previously described, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite the shaped identification feature in addition to the hologram. Nowhere in Yang is such a shaped feature in combination with a hologram taught. Because Faris, Steenblik and Kaule also fail to teach such limitations, claims 1 and 3 are distinguishable and in condition for allowance.

Added Claims

Claim 15 has been added to recite a metal identification platelet equipped with an identification code, where the identification code comprises a hologram. Further, the identification code comprises a shaped hole extending through the platelet. As previously described, none of the cited references teach the combination of a hologram and a shaped hole

extending through the platelet to form an identification code. Hence, claim 15 is distinguishable over the cited art.

Independent claim 16 claims a method of producing an identification platelet with an identification code. The method includes the step of forming a shield from an electro-insulation material on a shim with a holographic motif, where the shield defines at least one region having a certain shape. The shim is galvanized in places not covered by the shield from the electro-insulation material. The completed metal identification platelet is removed from the shim, and the resulting platelet includes an identification code comprising a through hole having the certain shape. As previously described, none of the cited references teach the combination of a hologram and a shaped through hole that forms an identification code. Hence, claim 16 is distinguishable over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Further, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment in connection with this paper to Deposit Account No. 20-1430.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

/darin j gibby/
Darin J. Gibby
Reg. No. 38,464

KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
DJG/kmh
63265100 v1